

Criminal Code

Even for 20 per cent, even for 15 per cent, it is necessary that restrictions be clearly mentioned in the law.

I hope that I made myself understood, and that the government members will stop shouting at us that we do not know anything about it. I think that when one has raised eight children and when one wants them in good health—our daughters and boys too—I believe that we have our word to say, and the government will realize that the Canadian people of Quebec have still a lot to say in these decisions and in these laws, these two laws against nature which are going to be voted on in a few days.

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member wants to speak he must be in his seat. I recognize the hon. member for Richmond, and possibly I will return to the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Since my speech was meant for the members of the Ralliement créditiste, I wanted to get on the same level so as to be better understood.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must remind the hon. member of the rules of this house. He must speak from his seat.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the business of the house, but I believed I ought to speak for a few minutes in order to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) and explained by our colleague from the Ralliement créditiste, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau).

First, so as to set the problem in its proper perspective and emphasize the absolute necessity of this amendment, one must know its true nature. The amendment says in part, and I quote:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code... be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or health" on line 5, on page 43.

One needs only to know what health means here. Where does it begin? Or is it possible, certainly possible, or probably possible, to lose health?

I believe that word implies many things and especially a lot of ways of thinking. In order that doctors may come to a positive and sure diagnosis, one must, know, when analyzing the word "health" as regards pregnancy, if such a pregnancy is or will be successful, as far as the mother's health is concerned.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, looking at the words "or health" in the wording of the bill before us today, such wording must determine the right of the therapeutic committee, comprised of three members, to decide whether abortion is to be performed or not so as to protect the mother's health.

Mr. Speaker, I think that to make a positive diagnosis, with sufficient certainty, and to decide whether to practice or order an abortion, doctors certainly need much instinct and knowledge, because they have told the hon. members of the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, that it is very difficult to decide whether a pregnancy is likely to undermine the health of a woman.

The bill before the house, which we want to amend by eliminating the words "or health", in terms of science and medicine and according to the doctors who have come before the committee, is very difficult to understand and even more so to explain.

This is a very serious question, to decide whether prejudice should be caused to a living being, be it a foetus or even a child, one or two weeks before term. I think it is very important to know where we are going. That is the substance of what many doctors or specialists told the committee on that subject.

Neither the gynecologists nor the specialists in any field could come up with a certain and definite conclusion.

First of all, regarding moral health, it was often mentioned by previous speakers that there can be no psychological reason for prescribing a therapeutic abortion.

It was also mentioned times after times that a nervous breakdown or other psychological troubles cannot be cured by an abortion. It is the abortion itself which causes these troubles and not the pregnancy.

We cannot kill a child in his mother's womb because she suffers from psychological problems.

Why should innocents pay for others' diseases? If this bill is passed as it is now, if it is not amended, psychological grounds will often be invented out of whole cloth to justify the decision or, perhaps, a divided decision of